

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the remarks and amendments provided herein.

The drawings were objected to due to an inconsistency in labeling of the drawings and the description of the elements throughout the specification. Accordingly, corrected drawings sheets are enclosed herewith in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d).

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner indicated particular aspects of claims 1-5 that he considered unclear. Accordingly, such claims have been amended to cure any indefiniteness. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pizzo (U.S. Patent No. 5,752,759). Traversal of this rejection is made for at least the following reasons. Pizzo does not disclose a crashable connecting portion that connects an operation portion and a mounting portion and is adapted to be crashed upon an impact force exerted on the operation portion, such that when the crashable connecting portion is crashed, the operation portion moves with respect to the mounting portion, as required by claim 1. The Examiner relies on supporting ribs 36 of Pizzo as being equivalent to the claims crashable connecting portion. However, the relied upon supporting ribs 36 are not adapted to be crashed upon an impact force exerted on the cylindrical shell 16, which the Examiner relies upon as being equivalent to the claimed operation portion. In fact there is nothing within Pizzo that discloses, teaches, or suggests that the supporting ribs 36 do anything other than to provide structural support between the cylindrical shell 16 and a D-shaped aperture 28.

Because Pizzo does not disclose each and every limitation set forth in claim 1, Pizzo cannot anticipate claim 1 or claims 2-7, which depend therefrom. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pizzo (U.S. Patent No. 5,752,759). Traversal of this rejection is made for at least the following reasons. Claim 6 depends from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable over Pizzo for

Appl. No. 10/767,983
Amdt. dated August 30, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 10, 2005

the aforementioned reasons. Accordingly, Pizzo does not render claim 6 obvious. withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pizzo (U.S. Patent No. 5,752,759) in view of Howie, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,688,461). Traversal of this rejection is made for at least the following reasons. Claim 7 depends from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable over Pizzo for the aforementioned reasons. Howie, Jr. does not make up for the deficiencies of Pizzo. Thus, the combination of Pizzo and Howie, Jr. does not render claim 7 obvious. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 36416.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP



Una L. Lauricia, Reg. No. 48,998

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700
Date: August 30, 2005